



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,297	08/30/2006	Gay Joyce Cornelius	102792-608-10458P1 US	8924
27380	7590	03/28/2008		
NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS			EXAMINER	
875 THIRD AVE			NGUYEN, TUAN N	
18TH FLOOR				
NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3751	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/28/2008 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/597,297

Applicant(s)

CORNELIUS ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan N. Nguyen

Art Unit

3751

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/7/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-3 and 5-18 are objected to because of the following informalities: "the rim" on line 5 of claim 1 lack antecedent basis in the claim; "from which part liquid" in lines 2-3 of claim 3 is grammatically incorrect; and "treated.." on line 3 of claim 3 should be --treated.--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 3, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. With respect to claims 3 and 16, it is unclear as to what structure is being claimed in claim 3 since the claim invention of Fig. 1 does not appear to show such a claimed feature. With respect to claim 17, it is unclear as to what liquid is being claimed in claim 17 since the specification fails to set forth the bound or fails to define what liquid is of the type does not dry out to leave a solid residue. They are being examined as best understood.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 5-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreifuss (954,426) in view Klammeiteiner (5,457,822) and Ewing et al. (2,760,209).

Dreifuss discloses a device for dispensing a liquid into a vessel (29) having a reservoir (1,19) of fluid, which is obviously in liquid form, a syphonic-action elongated liquid delivery means (24,22) having a proximal end inside the reservoir adjacent the bottom thereof and a distal end (resting on the rim of bowl (29)) from which the fluid is dispensed as a liquid or as a vapor, the liquid delivery means is in the form of capillary feed means (24) and the device is self-priming via the capillary feed. Although the Dreifuss does not teach means for securing the device adjacent a rim of the vessel with the reservoir outside the vessel as claimed, attention is directed to the Klammeiteiner reference which discloses an analogous device for dispensing disinfectant having means (10, 10') for securing a reservoir (6), containing a liquid as claimed, to a rim of a vessel having the structures as claimed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ, on the Dreifuss device, means for securing a reservoir, containing a liquid as claimed, to a rim of a vessel as, for example, taught by Klammeiteiner in order to provide an alternative method and structure to secure a disinfectant reservoir to the rim of a

toilet vessel. The reservoir and tube (22) of Dreifuss can obviously be a flexible wall reservoir and the plastic tube (27) as, for example, taught by Ewing et al., which discloses an analogous dispensing device. The method of claim 18 would obviously be inherent in lieu of the discussion above.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreifuss in view Klammssteiner (as discussed above) and in further view of MoodyCliffe et al (2004/0049839).

Dreifuss in view Klammssteiner, as best understood, does teach a non-drying liquid, as claimed. However, MoodyCliffe et al. discloses a lavatory dispenser wherein the active liquid contains a humectant to prevent phase separation and precipitation; i.e. drying (Para. 0021). Therefore, it would have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilized a liquid with humectant in the device of Dreifuss in view Klammssteiner (if not already) to prevent accumulation of solid residue.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Williams (1,349,703) teaches dispensing device with capillary and syphonic action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan N. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (10:00-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on (571) 272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tuan Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3751

TN